

REMARKS

As a preliminary note, Applicant would like to call the Examiner's attention to the fact that this application is a divisional application of application No. 09/766,594, now U.S. Patent No. 6,678,635, and that during prosecution, the parent application was under art unit 2857. Applicant notes that the claims in the present application are substantially the same as the allowed claims of the parent, one set being drawn to a method and the other set being directed to the system.

Claims 15-17 and 30-56 are pending. Claims 15-17 and 30-56 have been amended. In the January 19, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15-17 and 30-56 (Examiner cites them as claims 1-29) according to 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner further rejected claims 15-17 and 30-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, stating that such a rejection is required if a 101 rejection is given. The Applicant has amended the claims to overcome such rejections and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw such rejections.

The present application is directed to a system for detecting occurrences of semantic temporal events, recorded in a media, based on observations extracted from input data and event models. The input data is fed into the system from some data source. Based on a specified event to be detected, multiple-layer models corresponding to the event are retrieved. The models are used to determine the types of temporal observations to be extracted from the input data. The extracted temporal observations are then used, in combination with the multiple-layer models of the event, to detect the occurrences of the event and isolate it on a media. The isolated event may then be stored for future use. Claim 15, as amended recites: *A computerized*

system for detecting a semantic temporal event *recorded on a media*, said system comprising:

a *computerized* knowledge-based modeling unit for generating multiple-layer models for identifying said semantic temporal event *recorded on the media*;

a storage mechanism for storing said multiple-layer models;

an *computerized* observation collection unit for extracting, from at least one data source, temporal observations recorded on the media according to said multiple-layer models; and

a *computerized* temporal event detection unit for detecting one or more occurrences of the semantic temporal event based on said temporal observations and said multiple-layer models.

The Examiner states that claims 1-17 are not claimed to be practiced on a computer, and therefore it is clear that the claims are not limited to practice in the technological arts. Claims 15-17 and 30-56 have all been amended to state that the system is a computerized system.

The Examiner also states that none of the claims are practical applications in the technological arts, believing that the claims manipulate "a set of abstract 'semantic temporal events' to solve purely algorithmic problems in the abstract." Applicant has amended the claims to state that the semantic temporal events are recorded on a media. The Applicant is not manipulating a semantic temporal event, but rather isolating it on the recorded media. For instance, if there is a videotape of a soccer game, the system can isolate the frames wherein a player makes a goal from the frames displaying other events (running around the field, timeouts, etc.) on the

videotape. The recording of the player making the goal is a semantic temporal event. Isolating such an event clearly produces a useful, tangible, and concrete result. However, the event may be any number of different events. The event may be the making of a goal, the sneezing of an individual, or a horse clearing the finish line, so long as the event is recorded in a form of media. What semantic temporal event is isolated is dependent upon the multiple-layer models that are used to identify it.

Given that the claims have been amended to state that they system is a computer system and further clarification that the claims produce a tangible and useful product, Applicants request that the Examiner's rejections be withdrawn.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

Date: April 18, 2005

By: 

Roger R. Wise
Registration No. 31,204
Attorney for Applicants

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033